

**Martin Luther on Nestorius and Eutyches in *On the Councils
and the Church* (1539)**

by

David R. Boisclair, M.Div., S.T.M.

May 2005

Revised, August 2012

STARTING FROM *ON THE COUNCILS AND THE CHURCH*

In *On the Councils and the Church* (1539) Martin Luther examines in some depth the acts, decrees, and canons of the first four Ecumenical Councils of the church in order to determine how useful such a council would be in reforming the church. He is assisted in this by a reading of the then new compendium *Concilia Omnia* compiled by Peter Crabbe and Peter Quentel.¹

In taking a closer look at the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451), Dr. Luther offers his conclusions on Nestorius and Eutyches, which appear simplistic at first blush; however, after careful reflection, these conclusions may be considered insightful for understanding how the opposite heresies of Nestorianism and Eutychianism work. Luther came to his conclusions through sources more limited than those of the present day. Friedrich Loofs, a German patristic scholar of the Nineteenth Century, who advocated a revisionist approach to Nestorius, took note of Luther's treatment of Nestorius in *On the Councils and the Church* and observes:

Luther thought that, besides [Nestorius's] want of learning, it was fatal for Nestorius that he was a boorish and proud man. This judgment was based on insufficient knowledge of the sources.²

Luther merely passes on what he as learned from the church historian Socrates Scholasticus via the *Historia Tripartita*³ without, however, excusing Nestorius's error on

¹ Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther: The Preservation of the Church 1532-1546*, trans. James L. Schaaf, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 195; cf. Eric Gritsch introduction with footnote 17 to *On the Councils and the Church*, Martin Luther, *Luther's Works: American Edition*, Jaroslav Jan. Pelikan, and Helmut T. Lehmann, gen. eds., 55 vols., (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955-86) [hereinafter *AE*], 41:7.

² Friedrich Loofs, *Nestorius: And His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine*, Burt Franklin Reprints, (New York: Lenox Hill Pub. & Dist. Co., 1975), 61-62.

account of his perceived theological ignorance. That the historical judgment is ultimately Socrates's is related by Loofs:

Socrates, the church historian, regarded, as we saw, the dogmatic charges against Nestorius as essentially unfounded. He thought the fault of Nestorius was his lack of knowledge.⁴

Examining the primary sources for Nestorius discovered since the time of Dr. Luther evokes the question: "How accurate are Luther's conclusions based on a study of the sources available to us in the Twenty-first Century, aided by such scholars as Loofs and Bethune-Baker?" Loofs looks askance at Luther's "insufficient knowledge." From cursory inspection Luther's assessment of Nestorius in *On the Councils and the Church* does not seem to be so wide of the mark⁵ of accuracy:

Thus Nestorius' error was not that he believed Christ to be a pure man, or that he made two persons of him; on the contrary, he confesses two natures, the divine and the human, in one person—but he will not admit a *communicatio idiomatum*. I cannot express that in one word in German. *Idioma* means that which is inherent in a nature or is its attribute, such as dying, suffering, weeping, speaking, laughing, eating, drinking, sleeping, sorrowing, rejoicing, being born, having a mother, suckling the breast, walking, standing, working, sitting, lying down, and other things of that kind, which are called *idiomata naturae humanae*, that is, qualities that belong to man by nature, which he can and must do or even suffer; for *idioma* in Greek, *proprium* in Latin, is a thing—let us, for the time being, call it an attribute. Again, an *idioma deitatis*, "an attribute of divine nature," is that it is immortal, omnipotent, infinite, not born, does not eat, drink, sleep, stand, walk, sorrow, weep—and what more can one say? To be God is an immeasurably different thing than to be man; that is why

³ AE 41:8.

⁴ Loofs, *op cit.*, 61 with footnote 2; Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 7, 32, 8: ἀγνοοῦντα εἰς αἰὲρ ἰσχύοντα ἀνθρώπου.

⁵ Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 65 vols., (Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1883-) [Hereinafter WA] 50, 585.9-11; AE 41, 97: "You may read a page or two of the *Historia Tripartita*, Book XII, chapter 4, which you can do in half of a quarter of an hour, wherein is written everything that one can really know about Nestorius and this council, **and see if I hit the mark**" [cf. SA 5, 543.15: "Vnd sihe drauff ob ichs treffe"].

the *idiomata* of the two natures cannot coincide. That is the opinion of Nestorius.⁶

From Socrates Scholasticus he got the narrowing of the error down to simply denying to Mary the designation *qetoko-*; on his own he concluded it to be a non-admission of the communication of attributes. This connection is seen by J.N.D. Kelly by benefit, no doubt, of Luther:

The disputed title, we recall, was widely accepted in the Alexandrian school; it followed from the *communicatio idiomatum*, and expressed the truth that, since His Person was constituted by the Word, the Incarnate was appropriately designated God.⁷

Kelly would point out later that for Nestorius the communication of attributes amounted to nothing more but a matter of words, (*omwnumw-*) equivocally, by way of having the same name. A fragment of one of Nestorius's sermons gives reference to this:

For, on the one hand, the Son by nature and truly, the One from God [the] Father is Logos; and, on the other hand, the Son in the way of having the same name (*omwnumw-*) as the Son ...

The Logos of God is not flesh, but an assumed man (*ahqrwpon ajellhfwr-*). For, on the one hand, the unique one (*monogenh-*), previously by Himself, is the Son of the God, the maker (*dhmiourgou*) of all; and, on the other hand, a man, whom He assumed, who although he is not God by nature, truly is called God's Son because of him who assumed him in the way of having the same name (*omwnumw-*) as he. For no one knew the Son unless the Father made known the Son of the Father by nature and truth; and what was said by Gabriel, "Do not fear, Mary, for you found favor with God; and, behold, you will conceive and bear a Son, and you will call His name Jesus," adapted to the man.⁸

Denying a real communication of attributes is no trivialization of the Christological error committed by Nestorius as Luther points out:

⁶ AE 41, 100-01; WA 50, 587.29-34; SA 5, 545.23-37.

⁷ J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978), 311.

⁸ Frierich Loofs, *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius*, (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905), 217-18 [my translation].

Just such a man was Nestorius, who admits that Christ is God and man in one person; but because his divinity does not come from his mother Mary, she should not be called God's mother. **This was rightly condemned in the council, and ought to be condemned**⁹

for:

he who denies the *idiomata* or attributes of a nature can be said to deny the substance or nature itself. So the verdict should have been, "Although Nestorius confesses that Christ, true God and true man, is one person, but does not ascribe the *idiomata* of human nature to the same divine person of Christ, he is in error, just as much as if he denied the nature itself."¹⁰

Luther finds that Eutyches makes the same error as Nestorius did, although conversely:

Eutyches' opinion is also (like that of Nestorius) in error regarding the *idiomata*, but in a different way. Nestorius does not want to give the *idiomata* of humanity to the divinity in Christ, even though he maintains that Christ is God and man. Eutyches, on the other hand, does not want to give the *idiomata* of divinity to the humanity, though he also maintains that Christ is true God and true man. It is as though I preached that the "Word," God's Son, is creator of heaven and earth, equal to the Father in eternity, John 1 [:3], and that the "Word," the same Son of God, is true man, John 1 [:14]—Eutyches would grant me that and not doubt it. But if I continue and preach that this same man Christ is creator of heaven and earth, then Eutyches takes offense and is outraged at the words, "A man created heaven and earth," and says, "No! Such a divine *idioma* (as creating heaven) does not appertain to man." But he forgets that he previously conceded that Christ is true God and man in one person and nevertheless refuses to admit the conclusion or "the premise for a good conclusion.

For whoever confesses that God and man are one person must, by reason of such a union of the two natures in one person, also unquestionably concede that this man Christ, born of Mary, is creator of heaven and earth; for he has become this in one person, namely, God who created heaven and earth. Eutyches does not understand such a conclusion, and yet he firmly maintains that Christ is both God and man. Nor does he see that he must deny the human nature of Christ if he rejects the divine *idiomata* of the human nature; for that would divide the person, and Christ would not remain man. And this is what those who write about Eutyches intended to show: he did not allow the human

⁹ AE 41, 99; WA 50, 586.27-31; SA 5, 544.28-31 [emphasis added].

¹⁰ AE 41, 104; WA 50, 590.38—591.4; SA 5, 548.37—549.5.

nature in Christ to remain “in his conclusion,” though he confesses “in his premise” that the divine and human natures are one Christ, one person, and two natures. To sum up, as was said earlier, whoever confesses the two natures in Christ, God and man, must also ascribe the *idiomata* of both to the person; for to be God and man means nothing if they do not share their *idiomata*. That is why both Nestorius and Eutyches were rightfully condemned because of their error and reason.¹¹

Eutyches maintained his orthodoxy, nonetheless, in a confession attributed to him:

For I have held the same as my forefathers and from my boyhood have been illuminated by the same Faith as that which was laid down by the holy Synod of 318 most blessed bishops who were gathered at Nicæa from the whole world, and which was confirmed and ratified afresh for sole acceptance by the holy Synod assembled at Ephesus: and I have never thought otherwise than as the right and only true orthodox Faith has enjoined.¹²

In identifying the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches as a failure to confess the *communicatio idiomatum*, Luther points out that the doctrine of the communication of attributes would have delivered Nestorius and Eutyches from either dividing Christ into two persons or denying Him either of His perfect natures. Although there was the apostolic preaching of Christ that was attuned to the New Testament, to which Nestorius and Eutyches had run afoul, the doctrine of the communication of attributes awaited further definition and elaboration.

Luther further identified the reason for Nestorius and Eutyches going wrong even though they confessed Christ one Person in two natures. They commit an error in logic: “granting the premise and denying the conclusion”¹³:

¹¹ AE 41, 108-109; WA 50, 595.2-34; SA 5, 552.29—553.27.

¹² Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, translated into English with Prolegomena and Explanatory Notes, 14 vols., (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1900), 12:34 [hereinafter *NPNF*²].

¹³ *Antecedens concedere et consequens negare*: AE 41, 113; WA 50, 599.1; SA 5, 557.4.

Here you see Nestorius' logic which admits a "premise" and denies the "conclusion" and thus also falsifies the premise. If the one is true, the other must also be true in any real conclusion or consequence. On the other hand, if the last is false, the first must also be false. ... But this was the lack in both Nestorius and Eutyches, as happens to many other people in other matters. They both were certainly sincere when they regarded Christ as God and man in one person—as the histories as well as the records of the councils indicate—and yet, they could not reconcile themselves to the conclusion or consequence that the person who is both God and man was really crucified and created heaven; God could not be crucified or man create heaven.¹⁴

Luther sees this error committed by himself, the humanists, the jurists, the Romanists, and the Antinomians in teaching and practice as well.¹⁵ Luther calls this not only error but stupidity:

Now if Nestorius and Eutyches stubbornly and proudly clung to their opinion (as I neither can nor should judge from the histories I read) after the bishops had instructed them, they were justly condemned not only as heretics but also as silly fools.¹⁶

Of course, the error and stupidity might be symptoms of an even worse disease that strikes at the heart of the Christian faith that God became man to redeem man from sin in His own way, not in the way that man with his philosophy would impose upon Him. Nestorius and Eutyches and other fathers and heretics in the times after the age of the New Testament felt very uncomfortable with the idea that God would become as human as He did in Jesus Christ, no doubt influenced by neo-Platonism and Gnosticism, to the point that their concept of salvation was more about making us less human and more divine than about giving us forgiveness of sins and eternal life as human beings.

¹⁴ AE 41, 112; WA 50, 597.30-33, 598.15-22; SA 5, 555.24-27, 556.9-16.

¹⁵ AE 41, 110-115 ; WA 50, 596.17—600.19; SA 5, 554.11—558.24.

¹⁶ AE 41, 115; WA 50, 600.20-23; SA 5, 558.25-28.

This is brought home to us in Dr. Nagel's chapter in *Seven-Headed Luther* where the Apostolic Father Ignatius is examined:

He uses paradoxes born of Platonic dualism to extol the Incarnation, which is then the more wondrous the more opposite the divine and the human are considered to be. Terms of human limitation and weakness are negated to become the universal and infinite attributes of God, and man in turn the opposite of these, and the way of his salvation is then his way of attaining them. Jesus is the conjunction of the human and the divine and so he shows the way.¹⁷

Having started with *On the Councils and the Church* to see how Luther regarded Nestorius and Eutyches, a closer look will now be made at each of them with Luther's correct observation that they were guilty of the same error run in different ways. The consequences to the Gospel will also be highlighted.

¹⁷ Norman E. Nagel, "II. Martinus: 'Heresy, Doctor Luther, Heresy!' The Person and Work of Christ," *Seven-Headed Luther: Essays in Commemoration of a Quincentenary 1483-1983*, edited by Peter Newman Brooks, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 27.

WE SEE THAT NESTORIUS AND EUTYCHES MADE THE SAME ERROR RUN IN OPPOSITE DIRECTIONS

The errors of Nestorius and Eutyches fit Martin Luther's definition of what a heresy is:

... I have also noticed that all error, heresy, idolatry, offense, misuse, and evil in the church originally came from despising or losing sight of this article of faith in Jesus Christ. And if one looks at it correctly and clearly, all heresies do contend against this dear article of Jesus Christ ...¹⁸

More specifically this is to “diminish, distort, and divide (or deny) Christ.”¹⁹ Both of them did their best to see to it that Christ's divine nature was kept whole and intact. It was His human nature that they diminished, distorted, and divided (or denied) with respect to His divine nature. With Nestorius the concern was to isolate the divine nature from being “contaminated” by any hint of passibility (*apanteia*), and with Eutyches the concern is to express the unity of the Person of Christ in the closest possible way.

Nestorius (c. 386—c. 451), an “Antiochene School” alumnus,²⁰ disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428), wanted to safeguard the church's confession of Christ from Arianism and Apollinarianism, so he objected to the title of *qeotoko~* for Mary: God the Logos had no beginning as the Arians said He did and He did not substitute for any component of the Man Jesus, e.g. His soul, or His spirit, as Arians and Apollinaris said He did; hence, God the Logos could have no mother, and Mary could not be *qeotoko~*. One of Nestorius's strongest present day supporters, Milton Anastos, maintains that even though he conceded the use of *qeotoko~* for Mary, Nestorius in his

¹⁸ *AE* 34, 207-208; *WA* 50, 267.18.

¹⁹ Nagel, *op. cit.*, 26.

²⁰ St. Cyril of Alexandria was an “Alexandrine School” alumnus.

later apology *Bazaar of Heracleides* would not speak of her as the mother of God the Word. Milton Anastos relates Nestorius to the Formula of Union (433) and the Chalcedonian fathers, who approved that concordat:

At the same time, granting Nestorius to have been technically correct on all these matters, we can be sure that the Chalcedonians would have been bewildered by his strange view that God only “passed through the holy virgin, the ‘mother of Christ’, ” but was not born of her.²¹

This means, of course, that Nestorius did not honestly concede the *qetoko-*.

Although one should be wary of his presuppositions, Adolf von Harnack makes an insightful observation about Nestorius and his fellow Antiochenes:

The Antiochians based their position on the ὁμοούσιος and did not wish either to interfere with the divine personality of the Logos. But at the same time they fully accepted the perfect humanity of Christ. The most important characteristic of perfect humanity is its freedom. The thought that Christ possessed a free will was the lode-star of their Christology.²² To this was added the other thought that the nature of the Godhead is absolutely unchangeable and incapable of suffering. Both of these thoughts have at least no concern with the belief in the real redemption of humanity from sin and death through the God-man. *The Christology of the Antiochians was therefore not soteriologically determined*; on the contrary, the realistic-soteriological elements were attached to it by way of supplement.²³

²¹ Milton V. Anastos, “Nestorius Was Orthodox” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Number 16:117-140, (Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, Publisher, 1962), 139. Nestorius: “How therefore do I call Christ any other than God the Word, him who was born of the Father? I have said that he passed through even the blessed Mary, because he derived not the origin of [his] birth from her as the bodily frame which was born of her. For this reason I have said that he who is God the Word has surely passed through but was surely not born, because he derived not his origin from her. But there both exists and is named one Christ, the two of them being united, he who was born of the Father in the divinity, [and] of the holy virgin in the humanity, for there was a union of the two natures” [G.R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson, Leonard, trans. and eds., *Nestorius: The Bazaar of Heracleides. Newly translated from the Syriac and edited with an Introduction, Notes & Appendices*, (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1925), 296].

²² Cyril’s doctrine of the hypostatic union left no room for the either nature of Christ to exercise free will in coming into the conjunction (*sunatfeia*) that Nestorius believed better denoted the unity that is Christ. J.N.D. Kelly: “It was all-important in his eyes that the impassibility of ‘the God’ should be preserved, and that ‘the man’ for his part should retain his spontaneity and freedom of action” [J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978), 314]. Cf. also Roberta C. Chestnut, “The Two Prosopa in Nestorius’ *Bazaar of Heracleides*,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 29 (1978):404-05.

²³ Adolf von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Neil Buchanan, trans., 7 vols, Reprint, (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961), 4:165-166 [emphasis original].

Considering the devastating effect this Christology has on Soteriology, this comes as no surprise.

While Cyril of Alexandria cannot be exculpated from ecclesiastical intrigue, he can be honored as the father, who opposed Nestorianism because of its effect on the doctrine of salvation. Henry Chadwick brilliantly sets this out in his “Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy.”²⁴

Eutyches (c. 378-454) a staunch opponent of Nestorianism and disciple of Cyril was an archimandrite over 300 monks in Constantinople. Like Nestorius he was not the leading theologian of his doctrine. In fact, he was considered muddle-headed.²⁵ He confessed Christ solely in one nature, which he taught was *omoousio*~ with God but not *omoousio*~ with us. His monophysitism delivered a nature of Christ that was seen as a *tertium quid*, neither divine or human;²⁶ however, his confession put forward the nature as divine.

J.N.D. Kelly follows Theodoret of Cyrus in his *Eranistes*²⁷ to give another perspective of the views of these monophysites:

... people who, holding that Christ’s humanity and divinity formed “one nature,” taught that the former had not really been derived from the Virgin, and that it was the latter which had suffered [Theopascitism!] ... the divine nature

²⁴ Henry Chadwick, “Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 2 (1951): 145-164.

²⁵ Kelly, *op. cit.*, 331. Leo called him “*multum imprudens et nimis imperitus* [very imprudent and ignorant beyond measure]” in his Tome. Since “*periti*” were the expert theological consultants of bishops that accompanied them to conferences, synods, and councils, Leo characterizes Eutyches as the opposite: *imperitus*.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, 333.

²⁷ *Eranisth*~ means a participant in a banquet.

remains while the humanity is swallowed up (katapoqhñai) by it. The nature assumed was not annihilated, but rather transformed into the substance (οὐσία) of the divinity. Though he named no names, it is fairly certain that Theodoret had Eutyches in view.²⁸

Like Nestorius Eutyches, in effect, by his Christology denied the communication of attributes of divine attributes to Christ according to His human nature because Christ did not have a human nature according to Eutyches.

In November 448 Eutyches was cited before a sunodo~ ejdhmou~sa, a synod of bishops who happened to be in Constantinople at the time. Eusebius of Dorylaeum, who had first brought charges against Nestorius, was the accuser, and Patriarch Flavian of Constantinople was the president. Eutyches delayed appearing before the synod, but when he did appear it was demanded of him that he accept the formula ek duo fusew~ from the Formula of Union (433).²⁹ He did so only under duress. Under no circumstances would he willingly agree to two natures with respect to Christ.³⁰ Patriarch Flavian sends an account of Eutyches's doctrine to Patriarch Leo of Rome:

But casting away all shame, and shaking off the cloak which covered his error, he openly in our holy synod persisted in saying that our Lord Jesus Christ ought not to be understood by us as having two natures after His incarnation in one substance and in one person: nor yet that the Lord's flesh was of the same substance with us, as if assumed from us and united to God the Word hypostatically: but he said that the Virgin who bare him was indeed of the same substance with us according to the flesh, but the Lord Himself did not assume from her flesh of the same substance with us: but the Lord's body was not a

²⁸ Kelly, *op. cit.*, 331-332. The *Eranistes* of Theodoret is quoted by Kelly from Jacques Migne, ed., *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus, Series Græca*, 160 vols, (Paris: Bibliothecæ Cleri Universæ, 1863), 83:28-29, 153, 157.

²⁹ Kelly has it read: "We confess that Christ is of two natures (ek duo fusew~) after the incarnation, confessing one Christ, one Son, one Lord, in one *hupostasis* [υποστάσι~] and one *prosopon* [προσωπον]" (*Ibidem*).

³⁰ Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, Vol. 1: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451), translated by John Bowden, (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 523-525.

man's body, although that which issued from the Virgin was a human body, resisting all the expositions of the holy Fathers.³¹

Bishop Leo of Rome as an orthodox confessor of Christ saw himself between two poles: Nestorius as one, Eutyches as the other.³² On June 13, 449 Leo writes his letter to Flavian that becomes known as the Tome of Leo in which Christ is confessed in two natures, each nature doing what is proper to it.³³ Leo was confessing the *genus apotelesmaticum* of the communication of attributes along with the Personal Union. This would be confirmed at Chalcedon (451) along with the four adverbs. Eutychianism is defended against even though Monophysitism would continue to plague the church.

³¹ Letter XXII, The first from Flavian, Bp. of Constantinople to Pope Leo, *NPNF*² 12, 35.

³² *Ibidem*, x.

³³ *Ibidem*, 38-43 ; T. Herbert Bindley, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*, Revised by F.W. Green, Fourth Edition, (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1950), 157-180, 224-231.

AND WE KNOW WHAT WE MAY BE UP AGAINST IN CONFESSING CHRIST FAITHFULLY

Martin Luther teaches the church of all ages to confess Jesus Christ faithfully. This is the church's received dominical mandate and institution, which it carries out in accordance with the mandate and institution of the office of the holy ministry. In circumstances when that confession is hindered by heresy, the diminution, distortion, division, and denial of Jesus Christ, the church further clarifies and defends its confession, and rejects the heresy. Not only Christology is at stake but also Soteriology, for a Christ deficient in either or both of His natures would not be able to save the world. Luther in *On the Councils and the Church* shows how that was done in the first four Ecumenical Councils. Nestorius and Eutyches provided specific instances of how these councils did what they had to do.

Knowing the heresies of the past helped Luther identify contemporary heresy: Luther saw Sacramentarianism as Nestorianism redivivum.³⁴ Luther knew that this type of teaching, embraced and exemplified by Ulrich Zwingli especially in his "Alloeosis" method of biblical interpretation, affected Soteriology in reducing Christ to a mere man.³⁵ We can testify that in our own day many of the errors that spring up are no different from the errors of the past, confirming Qoheleth's words: "What has been is what will be, and what has been done is what will be done, and there is nothing new under the sun" (Eccl. 1:9). While this is true of faith-destroying error, it can be confessed of our Lord that He is the same yesterday, today, and forever (Heb. 13:8).

³⁴ AE 41, 105; WA 50, 591.9-21; SA 5, 549.10-22

³⁵ Beware, beware, I say, of this alloeosis, for it is the devil's mask since it will finally construct a kind of Christ after whom I would not want to be a Christian, that is, a Christ who is and does no more in his passion and his life than any other ordinary saint. For if I believe that only the human nature suffered for me, then Christ would be a poor Savior for me, in fact, he himself would need a Savior. In short, it is indescribable what the devil attempts with this alloeosis! (AE 37, 209-10).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramowski, Luise and Alan E. Goodman. eds. and trans. *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, No. 18. 2 vols. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1972.
- Anastos, Milton V. "Nestorius Was Orthodox." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. Number 16:117-140. Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, Publisher, 1962.
- Andresen, Carl, et al. *Die Lehrentwicklung im Rahmen der Katholizität*. Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte, Band 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche: Herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgischen Konfession 1930*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976 [cited as *BKS*].
- Bethune-Baker, J.F. *Nestorius and his Teaching: a fresh examination of the evidence*. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1908.
- Bettenson, Henry and Maunder, Chris, eds. *Documents of the Christian Church*. New Edition. Oxford: University Press, 1999.
- Bindley, T. Herbert, ed. *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith*. Revised by F.W. Green. Fourth Edition. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1950.
- Brecht, Martin. *Martin Luther: His Road to Reformation: 1483-1521*. Translated by James L. Schaaf. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1985.
- _____. *Martin Luther: Shaping and Defining the Reformation: 1521-1532*. Translated by James L. Schaaf. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990.
- _____. *Martin Luther: The Preservation of the Church: 1532-1546*. Translated by James L. Schaaf. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Brock, S.P. "The Nestorian Church: A Lamentable Misnomer," *John Rylands Library Bulletin* 78 (1996) 3:23-35.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy." *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 2 (1951): 145-164.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *Loci Theologici*. Translated by J.A.O. Preus. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1989.

- _____. *The Two Natures in Christ*. Translated by J.A.O. Preus. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971.
- Chestnut, Roberta C. "The Two Prosopa in Nestorius' *Bazaar of Heraclides*." *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 29 (1978):392-409.
- Cross, F.L. and Livingston, E.A., eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Second Edition. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Cunliffe-Jones, Hubert and Drewery, Benjamin, eds. *A History of Christian Doctrine: In Succession to the Earlier Work of G.P. Fisher*. N.p.: T. & T. Clark, Ltd., 1978; New Edition: Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Davis, Leo Donald. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1983.
- Driver, G.R. and Hodgson, Leonard, trans. and eds. *Nestorius: The Bazaar of Heracleides. Newly translated from the Syriac and edited with an Introduction, Notes & Appendices*. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Greer, R.A. "The Use of Scripture in the Nestorian Controversy." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 20 (1967):413-422.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Vol. 1: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451). Translated by John Bowden. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- _____. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. Vol. 2, Pt. 1: From Chalcedon to Justinian I. Translated by Pauline Allen and John Cawte. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987.
- Hallman, Joseph M. "The Seed of Fire: Divine Suffering in the Christology of Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius of Constantinople." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1997) 3:369-391.
- Hardy, Edward R. and Richardson, Cyril C. *Christology of the Later Fathers*. The Library of Christian Classics: Ichthus Edition. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *History of Dogma*. Translated by Neil Buchanan. 7 vols. Reprint, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1961.
- Headley, John M. *Luther's View of Church History*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1963.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978.

Kolb, Robert and Wengert, Timothy J., eds. and trans. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Loofs, Friedrich. *Nestoriana: Die Fragmente des Nestorius*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905.

_____. *Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Doctrine*. Burt Franklin Reprints. New York: Lennox Hill Publishing and Distribution Co., 1975.

Luther, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers sämtliche Schriften*. Edited by Johann Georg Walch. Edited and published in modern German, 23 vols. in 25. St Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1880-1910 [Designated *St.L*].

_____. *D. Martin Luther's sämtliche Werke*. 104 vols. Frankfurt a. M. und Erlangen: Verlag von Heyder & Zimmer, 1826-57 [Designated *EA*].

_____. *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. 65 vols. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1883- .

_____. *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel*. 18 vols. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1930-85.

_____. *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Die Deutsche Bibel*. 12 vols. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1906-61.

_____. *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Tischreden*. 6 vols. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1912-21.

_____. *Luthers Werke in Auswahl*. Edited by Otto Clemen et al. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag, 1912-33; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1955-56 [Designated *BA*].

_____. *Luther's Works: American Edition*. Jaroslav Jan. Pelikan, and Helmut T. Lehmann, gen. eds. 55 vols. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955-86.

_____. *Martin Luther. Ausgewählte Werke*. 7 vols. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1948- . [Designated *MA*³].

_____. *Studienausgabe*. Band 5. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1992. [Designated *SA* 5].

_____. *Works of Martin Luther With Introductions and Notes: The Philadelphia Edition*. 6 vols. Philadelphia, PA: Muhlenberg Press, 1943 [designated *PE*].

- McGuckin, J.A. "Nestorius and the Political Factions of Fifth-Century Byzantium: Factors in His Personal Downfall." *John Rylands Library Bulletin* 78 (1996) 3:7-21.
- Migne, Jacques Paul. Editor. *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus, Series Latina*. 221 vols. Paris: Garnier, 1844-94.
- _____. *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus, Series Græca*. 160 vols. Paris: Bibliothecæ Cleri Universæ, 1863.
- Nagel, Norman Edgar, *Luther's Understanding of Christ in Relation to His Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1961.
- _____. "II. *Martinus*: 'Heresy, Doctor Luther, Heresy!' The Person and Work of Christ." *Seven Headed Luther: Essays in Commemoration of a Quincentenary 1483-1983*. Edited by Peter Newman Brooks. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Norris, Richard A., Jr. *The Christological Controversy*. Sources of Early Christian Thought. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Parmentier, Martin. "A Letter from Theodoret of Cyrus to the Exiled Nestorius (CPG 6270) in a Syriac Version." *Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 51 (1990):234-245.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*. Vol. 1, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Prestige, G.L. *Fathers and Heretics: Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue*. The Bampton Lectures for 1940. London: SPCK, 1948.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology*. 5 vols. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1960.
- Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*. 3 vols. St Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1950-53.
- Pieper, Franz. *Christliche Dogmatik*. 3 vols. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1917-24. [English translation: Pieper, Francis. *Christian Dogmatics*. 3 vols. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950-53].
- Roberts, Alexander et. al., eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. 9 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985 [Designated ANF].

- Sasse, Hermann. *We Confess*. 3 vols. Translated by Norman Nagel. St Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1986.
- Schäfer, Ernst. *Luther als Kirchenhistoriker. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaft*. Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1897.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: First Series*. 14 vols. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1889. Reprint, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983 [Designated *NPNF*¹].
- Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace, eds. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series: Translated into English with Prolegomena and Explanatory Notes*. 14 vols. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1900 [Designated *NPNF*²].
- Schlink, Edmund. *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*. Translated by Paul F. Koehneke and Herbert J. A. Bouman. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1961.
- Schmid, Heinrich. *The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Translated by Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1899.
- Sellers, R.V. *Two Ancient Christologies: A Study in the Christological Thought of the Schools of Alexandria and Antioch in the Early History of Christian Doctrine*. London: SPCK, 1954.
- Sullivan, Francis A. *The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia*. *Analecta Gregoriana Vol LXXXII Series Facultatis Theologicae Sectio B (n. 29)*. Rome: Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregoriana, 1956.
- Tappert, Theodore G. Tappert, trans. and ed. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. 6th ed. Edited by John Grossman and Alice Bennet. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Urbainczyk, Theresa. *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Wigram, W.A. *The Separation of the Monophysites*. London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1923.
- Young, Frances M. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and its Background*. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1983.